

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-9 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. No new matter has been added.

### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's remarks about the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on 3/25/2002 (Office Action, p. 3). Applicant further acknowledges that the IDS was voluminous and that some of the references cited in it were undated. Applicant believes, however, that copies of all of the cited references were in fact submitted by Applicant with that IDS (including those lined out by the Examiner); it is suggested that the missing references may have been misplaced by the USPTO.

Applicant does not know which of those cited references, if any, may be pertinent or relevant to the patentability of the present invention. In view of the large number of references and the fact that many of them were undated, Applicant has made no attempt to make such a determination in response to the Office Action, and Applicant is electing not to resubmit those references for consideration. It is noted, however, that most if not all of those references were cited and considered in the parent application.

Applicant is submitting a new IDS with this amendment, however, citing certain other references. It is respectfully requested that the information in the new IDS be considered.

### Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, the pending claims were deemed to recite allowable subject matter (Office Action, pp. 7-8). Claims 1-9 were rejected for obviousness-type double-patenting based on the issued parent, U.S. Patent no. 6,205,472. Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject-matter. Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

### Double-Patenting

Submitted with this amendment is a terminal disclaimer, which Applicant believes overcomes the obviousness-type double-patenting rejection.

### Section 101

The amendment to claim 4 is believed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

### Section 112(2)

The amendments to claims 1-9 are believed to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

### Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent

claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 6/29/06

  
Jordan M. Becker  
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 08791  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(408) 720-8300